

REMARKS

The Official Action mailed June 4, 2003, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for One Month Extension of Time*, which extends the shortened statutory period for response to October 4, 2003. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on August 30, 1999; April 26, 2001; February 28, 2002, and April 12, 2002.

Claims 7-26 are pending in the present application, of which claims 7, 11, 15, 19 and 23 are independent. The independent claims have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 3 of the Official Action rejects claims 7, 9-14 and 19-26 as obvious based on the combination of U.S. Patent No. 5,896,119 to Evanicky et al. and JP 08-211361 to Maruyama. The Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present invention, as amended.

As stated in MPEP §§ 2142-2143.01, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. "The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of

one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.” In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The prior art, either alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the features of the independent claims, as amended. Evanicky and Maruyama do not teach or suggest a battery. The present invention relates to an electronic device which comprises a liquid crystal display panel. The electronic device further comprises a light source comprising 3-color light emitting diodes. The electronic device also comprises a battery. The battery can generate a DC voltage. By applying the DC voltage to the 3-color light emitting diodes from the battery to emit lights from the 3-color light emitting diodes, the need for a DC-AC converter can be eliminated. Evanicky and Maruyama, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a battery.

Since Evanicky and Maruyama do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Paragraph 8 of the Official Action rejects claims 15-17 as obvious based on the combination of Evanicky, Maruyama and U.S. Patent No. 5,334,993 to Okajima et al. Okajima does not cure the deficiencies in Evanicky and Maruyama. The Official Action relies on Okajima to allegedly teach “a LCD having a backlight 111, the light guide plate 13 is made of a flat plate-shaped acrylic resin” (page 5, Paper No. 25). Evanicky, Maruyama and Okajima, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a battery. Since Evanicky, Maruyama and Okajima do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Paragraph 11 of the Official Action rejects claims 8 and 18 as obvious based on the combination of Evanicky, Maruyama and U.S. Patent No. 5,953,469 to Zhou. Zhou does not cure the deficiencies in Evanicky and Maruyama. The Official Action relies on Zhou to allegedly teach "the counter substrate 20 having a plurality of inclined surface[s] 31 on a back of the counter substrate 20" (Id.). Evanicky, Maruyama and Zhou, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a battery. Since Evanicky, Maruyama and Zhou do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are in order and respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric J. Robinson
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.
PMB 955
21010 Southbank Street
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165
(571) 434-6789